



## WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

17 FEBRUARY 2003 to 21 FEBRUARY 2003

### IN THIS ISSUE

#### CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

- :: UK Experts Say US Plan to Use Crowd Control Agents in Iraq is Illegal
- :: British Experts Inspect Serbian Chemical Plant for Manufacture of Illicit Agents
- :: Russia to Cooperate with Foreign Partners in Chemical Weapons Elimination

#### COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

- :: U.S. Explores Developing Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons

#### NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

- :: Powell to Confer With Asian Allies on N[orth] Korea
- :: Next week, United Nations Inspectors Get Their First Look at Iranian Nuclear Facilities
- :: Japan and Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Study

#### SMALL ARMS

- :: Nigeria; Worrying Problem of Small Arms Proliferation

#### UNMOVIC/IRAQ

- :: Inspectors Fault Iraqi Follow-Up; No 'Positive Moves' Seen Since Friday
- :: U.S., Britain to Set Deadlines for U.N., Iraq
- :: Some on Security Council Want to Avoid Taking Sides on Iraq

### CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC)

#### UK Experts Say US Plan To Use Crowd Control Agents in Iraq is Illegal

*Severin Carrell, The Independent on Sunday (London, Internet Version-WWW), 16 February 2003, transcribed in FBIS Document EUP20030216000081*

While American forces invading Iraq face the threat of chemical attack, they could themselves be using biochemical agents which are banned under international law. The US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, revealed earlier this month that American forces are planning to use "non-lethal" biochemical weapons such as anti-riot gases and crowd control agents if they invade Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee they were preparing to ask President George Bush for permission to use these weapons, known in military circles as "calmatives", on Iraqi civilians, in cave systems or to take prisoners. But two of Britain's leading authorities on chemical weapons, Professor Alistair Hay and Professor Julian Perry-Robinson, who are collaborating on an expert guide for the World Health Organization, said such weapons are illegal under the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention and the 1928 Geneva Protocol, which ban the use of chemical agents against people in wartime. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

#### British Experts Inspect Serbian Chemical Plant for Manufacture of Illicit Agents

*Belgrade RTS SAT Television, 1830 GMT, 17 February 2003, translated in FBIS Document EUP20030217000503*

False reports about the alleged production of banned chemical agents in the Milan Blagojevic Namenska chemical factory in Lucani are inflicting incalculable losses to this chemical plant. British experts visited the factory in Lucani today, touring the line for the production of commercial chemical substances.

[Begin video report by Branko Stefanovic] I believe that this visit will have a positive effect, said Ambassador Prvoslav Davinic, president of the national body for the implementation of the convention banning the manufacture of chemical weapons. British experts gained access to the entire factory. They also received chemical formulas of the products and were allowed to take photographs. All this will help them conclude that no illicit agents are being manufactured there. Namenska from Lucani is about to clinch a multi-million dollar export deal. However, this requires the lifting of the ban imposed on our military industry following the affair with the alleged violation of the arms embargo. [end recording] [Description of Source: Belgrade RTS SAT Television in Serbian -- Serbian state-television station] [Full text. No attachment.]





### **Russia to Cooperate with Foreign Partners in Chemical Weapons Elimination**

*Moscow ITAR-TASS, 2122 GMT, 19 February 2003, transcribed in FBIS Document*

*CEP20030219000470*

Russia is ready to cooperate with foreign partners to implement programs of chemical weapons destruction, Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said in his meeting with Rogelio Pflirter, Director General of the OPCW Technical Secretariat on Wednesday. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

### **COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY (CTBT)**

#### **U.S. Explores Developing Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons**

*Walter Pincus, Washington Post, 20 February 2003, p. 9, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

The Bush administration is reviving interest in developing low-yield nuclear devices that could be used to destroy targets, such as reinforced bunkers holding chemical or biological weapons, with less damage to the surrounding area than today's giant warheads, according to administration officials and government scientists.

[\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

### **NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT)**

#### **Powell to Confer With Asian Allies on N[orth] Korea**

*Sonni Efron, Los Angeles Times, 20 February 2003, p. 3, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell is to leave Friday for Japan, China and South Korea to shore up America's Asian alliances and coordinate strategy for dealing with an increasingly bellicose North Korea. The trip comes as the U.N. Security Council, deeply divided about Iraq, prepares to take up the question of what to do if North Korea proceeds with its threat to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and starts building a nuclear arsenal.

[\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

#### **Next week, United Nations Inspectors Get Their First Look at Iranian Nuclear Facilities**

*Guy Dinmore and Najmeh Bozorgmehr, Financial Times (London), 19 February 2003, p. 15, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

In testimony to Congress last week, George Tenet, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, revealed the depths of US concern over weapons proliferation to rogue states and terrorist groups. The US had seen "disturbing signs" that al-Qaeda had established a "presence" in both Iraq and Iran, and was expected to resume the offensive. "We have entered a new world of proliferation," Mr Tenet said of weapons of mass destruction. "The domino theory of the 21st century may well be nuclear." His comments followed confirmation by Gholam-Reza Aqazadeh, head of Iran's Nuclear Energy Organization, that Iran would develop the full cycle of nuclear fuel from the mining and processing of uranium to its enrichment and use in reactors for peaceful purposes. Just a few days earlier, he revealed that a plant in Isfahan for preparing uranium was close to completion. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

#### **Japan and Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Study**

*Asahi Shimbun, Tokyo, 20 February 2003, accessed via*

*<http://www.asahi.com/english/politics/K2003022000380.html>*

The most recent government study into the practicality of Japan developing nuclear weapons flatly dismissed the idea, saying it was not in the nation's best interests. With concern growing that North Korea is on the verge of developing a nuclear arsenal, some within Japan are calling for a like development of nuclear weapons. A copy of the Defense Agency's 1995 internal study report was obtained by *The Asahi Shimbun*. The study was undertaken because of growing concerns in neighboring nations that Japan was preparing to go nuclear in response to suspicions at that time that North Korea was developing nuclear weapons. The study marked the second time that nuclear weapons capability has been considered as a research topic. A study conducted between 1967 and 1970 also concluded that a nuclear arsenal was not feasible for Japan. Defense Agency officials said there are no records of studies into Japanese nuclear capability after 1995. That study found that the military balance in Asia would be upset if Japan did develop nuclear weapons. The report said that the development of nuclear weapons would have







several drawbacks. Japan would effectively destroy the basis for the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty; the reliability of the U.S. nuclear umbrella would be undermined and Japan would be viewed as distrustful of its military alliance with the United States; neighbors would fear that Japan was taking a more independent defense policy stance. The report also stated that Japan's narrow land mass and concentrated population made the political and economic costs of setting up the infrastructure to enable development of nuclear weapons exorbitant. The report concluded that relying on the American nuclear deterrent was the best option. The report also touched upon the possibility of North Korea developing a nuclear arsenal. It said there was a very low probability that the United States would allow Pyongyang to develop a nuclear capability. The report said that while North Korea's nuclear potential was an important national security issue, that issue would not serve as a condition for discussing the possibility of Japan itself possessing nuclear weapons. [Full text. No attachment.]

### SMALL ARMS

#### **Nigeria; Worrying Problem of Small Arms Proliferation**

*Africa News, 18 February 2003, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

At the last count, more than 30 communal clashes, bordering on religious ethnic conflicts have been recorded throughout the country between 1999 and 2002 with each claiming hundreds of lives and properties, running into several millions of naira. Similarly, many people, including women and children had been displaced in the process, resulting in untold hardship and suffering for them. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

### UNMOVIC/IRAQ

#### **Inspectors Fault Iraqi Follow-Up; No 'Positive Moves' Seen Since Friday**

*Rajiv Chandrasekaran, Washington Post, 20 February 2003, p. 1, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

President Saddam Hussein's government, apparently emboldened by antiwar sentiment at the U.N. Security Council and in worldwide street protests, has not followed through on its promises of increased cooperation with U.N. arms inspectors, according to inspectors in Iraq. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

#### **U.S., Britain to Set Deadlines for U.N., Iraq**

*Maggie Farley and Robin Wright, Los Angeles Times, 20 February 2003, p. 1, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

The United States and Britain will present a resolution to the Security Council "in the next few working days" authorizing the use of military force to disarm Iraq and imposing a deadline for the council to vote on it, U.S. and British officials said Wednesday. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)

#### **Some on Security Council Want to Avoid Taking Sides on Iraq**

*Felicity Barringer, New York Times, 20 February 2003, p. 14, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

Caught between domestic opposition to a war against Iraq and increasing pressure from the pro-war countries, diplomats from some of the uncommitted members of the Security Council said today that the Council's nonpermanent members should not be forced to take sides in the fight over a new resolution paving the way for war. [\[Click here for full text.\]](#)







### **UK Experts Say US Plan To Use Crowd Control Agents in Iraq is Illegal**

*Severin Carrell, The Independent on Sunday (London, Internet Version-WWW), 16 February 2003, transcribed in FBIS Document EUP20030216000081*

While American forces invading Iraq face the threat of chemical attack, they could themselves be using biochemical agents which are banned under international law. The US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, revealed earlier this month that American forces are planning to use "non-lethal" biochemical weapons such as anti-riot gases and crowd control agents if they invade Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee they were preparing to ask President George Bush for permission to use these weapons, known in military circles as "calmatives", on Iraqi civilians, in cave systems or to take prisoners. But two of Britain's leading authorities on chemical weapons, Professor Alistair Hay and Professor Julian Perry-Robinson, who are collaborating on an expert guide for the World Health Organization, said such weapons are illegal under the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention and the 1928 Geneva Protocol, which ban the use of chemical agents against people in wartime.

"It would be absolutely outrageous if they did this," said Prof Hay, an epidemiologist at Leeds University. "Surely this war against Iraq is to stop the use of those weapons, not about also using them."

The dangers of such weapons were exposed, the experts said, when Russian special forces used an opiate-based crowd control gas, with devastating consequences, on Chechen rebels holding theatergoers hostage in Moscow in October. Both men said Mr. Rumsfeld's comments also threatened to put the Pentagon on a collision course with Britain.

Ministry of Defense experts have repeatedly warned their US counterparts that their proposed use of these weapons in warfare is illegal.





**Russia to Cooperate with Foreign Partners in Chemical Weapons Elimination**

*Moscow ITAR-TASS, 2122 GMT, 19 February 2003, transcribed in FBIS Document CEP20030219000470*

Russia is ready to cooperate with foreign partners to implement programs of chemical weapons destruction, Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said in his meeting with Rogelio Pfirter, Director General of the OPCW Technical Secretariat on Wednesday. Ivanov recalled that during discussions on the program of global partnership by the G-8 summit in Kananaskis, Russian President Vladimir Putin accentuated on the chemical weapons destruction program as the top priority. "We are now engaged in an intensive dialogue with foreign partners, also with Americans", Ivanov said, making a reference to his recent meeting with Senator Richard Lugar. Moscow seeks to maintain constructive cooperation with the United States in this area, the Russian minister said. He said Russian also intends to develop "close cooperation" with the OPCW. Ivanov expressed the hope that the foreign partners will "appreciate the efforts taken by the Russian president and government in the matter". "Whether in Iraq we are only searching for chemical weapons, we know where to search for them and that it is necessary to eliminate them," he said. Pfirter noted that Russia closely interacts with the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons on this issue. At the same time, Ivanov said considerable progress in eliminating chemical weapons in Russia contributes to the solution of WMD non-proliferation problems and to the prevention of terrorist threats. The elimination of chemical weapons is in the focus of Russian leaders, the minister said. Pfirter gave a high assessment to Russia's efforts aimed at implementing its chemical weapons program and understood the existing difficulties in fulfilling obligations in this direction. Ivanov and Pfirter also exchanged views on the realisation of the chemical weapons convention and multifaceted cooperation in this field, including within the framework of the G-8 summit in Kananaskis on global partnership. The sides discussed international problems regarding the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the Foreign Ministry said in a statement transmitted to *Itar-Tass* on Wednesday. Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko said Russia decided to finance a federal program of chemical weapons destruction. Under the program, the government will provide 160 million U.S. dollars in the first 10 years. Last December Russia took the first step in this direction - it commissioned a chemical disposal plant in Gorny, Saratov region. Then Russia is planning to commission such plants in Shchuchye, Kurgan region, and Kambarka, Republic of Udmurtia. The rates and deadlines of chemical weapons destruction were into the focus of discussions between Sergei Kiriyyenko, chief of Russia's State Commission for Chemical Disarmament, and Rogelio Pfirter Kiriyyenko, who is also presidential plenipotentiary representative in the Volga Federal District, said the sides discussed action under the chemical weapons convention. The document is the first multilateral treaty that outlaws a whole class of mass destruction weapons and specifies the mechanisms of inspecting defense and civilian chemical industry facilities. The convention was signed by 145 countries. Russia has destroyed 100 tonnes of mustard gas and is continuing to scrap chemical weapons in two shifts, Kiriyyenko said. He stressed said the facility in Gorny, Saratov region, is now preparing to switch to a three-shift mode. Russia will destroy 1 percent of its 40,000 tonnes of chemical weapons in the first half of the year, thus fulfilling its international obligations, Kiriyyenko said. Russia is using modern technology to eliminate chemical weapons, Pfirter said. He said Russia observes the environmental norms. The director-general said the OPCW welcomes progress in the elimination of chemical weapons. In his words, the start of a plant in Gorny, Saratov region, is the necessary step in this direction that proves of Russia's commitment to complying with its obligations. Commenting on the elimination of toxic agents in Russia, Pfirter said the OPCW is satisfied with the work of the plant in Gorny. He said the OPCW has no objections regarding technology.







### U.S. Explores Developing Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons

*Walter Pincus, Washington Post, 20 February 2003, p. 9, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

The Bush administration is reviving interest in developing low-yield nuclear devices that could be used to destroy targets, such as reinforced bunkers holding chemical or biological weapons, with less damage to the surrounding area than today's giant warheads, according to administration officials and government scientists.

The program is based on views within the nation's nuclear weapons laboratories that as the United States reduces its stockpiles of larger nuclear weapons, it should replace them with smaller numbers of low-yield bombs. Low-yield nuclear weapons have much less explosive power than the large nuclear bombs that comprise today's strategic arsenal. Nuclear weapons strategists believe low-yield weapons would be a more credible deterrent against outlaw states and terrorist organizations with weapons of mass destruction. Since the bombs would inflict much less damage to the area outside the target than high-yield devices, the threshold for using them presumably would be lower. Low-yield nuclear weapons have been controversial since the late 1970s, when the Army tried to introduce neutron artillery shells and warheads with its forces in Europe. The explosion of the neutron weapon created enormous radiation, while its blast and heat -- though still powerful -- were smaller than traditional nuclear bombs. This made the weapon attractive to military officials planning for a possible war against the Soviet Union in Europe's densely populated areas.

Described as effective at killing people while leaving buildings standing, the neutron weapons were deferred by President Jimmy Carter after a public uproar in Europe and the United States. President Ronald Reagan revived the weapons, but President George H.W. Bush eliminated them as part of an agreement to reduce tactical nuclear weapons overseas.

Discussion of developing low-yield weapons returned in the 1990s when officials studied the possibility of creating high-altitude low-yield weapons to produce an electromagnetic pulse that could wipe out enemy communications and electronics.

The low-yield weapons being considered now would be designed to penetrate reinforced bunkers housing chemical or biological weapons and detonate underground, concentrating their explosive power and heat on the chemical or biological agents and reducing or eliminating radioactive fallout in the atmosphere, scientists say.

Officials from the Defense and Energy departments met at the Pentagon on Jan. 10 to discuss plans for a conference on the future of the U.S. nuclear stockpile, an Energy Department spokesman said. The idea of reviving the low-yield nuclear weapons development program was among the subjects to be discussed at the conference, scheduled for August at the Omaha headquarters of Strategic Command, the Pentagon command responsible for the country's nuclear arsenal.

"Requirements for low-yield weapons," including neutron or enhanced-radiation weapons that create less heat and minimize explosive effects, along with "agent defeat weapons" designed to neutralize chemical and biological weapons, were put on the agenda for a Future Arsenal Panel at that conference, according to notes from the Pentagon planning session. The notes were released this week by the Los Alamos Study Group, a New Mexico-based organization that tracks U.S. nuclear weapons activities.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld was asked about the notes at a Pentagon news conference yesterday. "I don't believe there is anything currently underway by way of developing new nuclear weapons," he said.

He added that the notes "referred not to the development of specific weapons, but the analysis that would go into determining whether or not something might or might not make sense."

The Future Arsenal Panel at the August meeting will discuss computer modeling for possible new nuclear devices and what type of testing, if any, would be needed, the notes say. The notes add that consideration of the new weapons is being prompted by the Nuclear Posture Review completed by the Bush administration last year.







The Nuclear Posture Review called for the reduction by two-thirds of the country's 6,000 operational nuclear warheads and bombs over the next 10 years. It provided for keeping several thousand warheads in a strategic reserve and allowed for the development of new weapons based on changed security requirements.

Under an arms control treaty reached by President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin last May, Russia committed itself to wholesale reductions in its strategic nuclear arsenal as well.

One of the most controversial features of the Nuclear Posture Review is that it seemingly left the door open to using nuclear weapons for a preemptive attack on a threatening foreign country. The new study of low-yield nuclear devices would be compatible with that provision.

Another matter before the August conference will be the prospect of resuming nuclear testing, the notes said. The conference also will study the impact of a resumption of testing on public opinion in the United States and abroad.

"They are going to discuss not only weapons and testing policies but the politics to get them approved," said Greg Mello, director of the Los Alamos Study Group. "It's rare that so many details about the nuclear weapons agenda of the Bush administration would appear in one document."

The August conference comes on top of the administration's 2004 budget request, which seeks money to continue refurbishing and modernizing thousands of deployed nuclear warheads. It also calls for study of a "robust earth penetrator," a nuclear device that would destroy buried, hardened underground bunkers for command posts or weapons storage.

The Nuclear Security Administration, which runs the nation's nuclear weapons complex at the Energy Department, is requesting \$ 6.4 billion next year, an increase from this year's \$ 5.9 billion and almost \$ 1 billion above the last budget presented by the Clinton administration. The new request calls for \$ 15 million for the earth penetrator and \$ 21 million for two of the nation's national nuclear weapons laboratories, Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore, to assemble design teams to study advanced nuclear concepts. The teams are being created so that the United States has the expertise to build new weapons or change existing ones, senior Energy Department officials said.

Last week, a House Republican policy committee recommended that the Pentagon's Nuclear Weapons Council revitalize advanced nuclear weapons development and that Congress consider repealing a 10-year ban on research on low-yield nuclear weapons, those whose explosions are less than 5 kilotons, the explosive equivalent of 5,000 tons of TNT.

"It allows the United States to have teams of scientists and engineers working on emerging threats and potential problems before they become severe," the GOP policy committee report said.







### Powell to Confer With Asian Allies on N[orth] Korea

*Sonni Efron, Los Angeles Times, 20 February 2003, p. 3, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell is to leave Friday for Japan, China and South Korea to shore up America's Asian alliances and coordinate strategy for dealing with an increasingly bellicose North Korea.

The trip comes as the U.N. Security Council, deeply divided about Iraq, prepares to take up the question of what to do if North Korea proceeds with its threat to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and starts building a nuclear arsenal.

The State Department delayed the announcement of the trip until Wednesday as the nation's chief diplomat weighed whether to stay home to focus on the fight for a second Iraq resolution at the United Nations. With North Korea snubbing a U.S. proposal for talks and threatening to quit the armistice that ended the Korean War, Powell opted to head for Asia. He will fly first to Tokyo, spend a second night in Beijing, then fly to Seoul to attend the Tuesday inauguration of Roh Moo Hyun, who won the South Korean presidency after a campaign marked by anti-Americanism.

In all three capitals, Powell will probably be seeking support for a Security Council resolution that condemns North Korea's nuclear ambitions and calls on the isolated communist state to comply with international nuclear norms, sources said.

In his private meetings, Powell is expected to gingerly explore what kind of measures each nation might be prepared to take if North Korea refines plutonium that could be used for nuclear bombs.

Options might include more economic pressure from China; cutting off remittances from ethnic Koreans in Japan to their relatives in North Korea; and redoubling efforts to make sure that dual-use technologies and materials are not sold or smuggled to North Korea, experts said.

Publicly, the Bush administration says it is committed to a diplomatic resolution and does not seek sanctions. The South Korean, Chinese and Russian governments strongly oppose sanctions as ineffective or even counterproductive. Japan, awash in public outrage over past North Korean abductions of its citizens, has been more sympathetic but not openly supportive of the idea.

But some U.S. officials and independent analysts voiced concern that North Korea may have concluded that its nuclear weapons program offers the only real road to security and has no intention of negotiating it away. If so, the allies would be faced with the challenge of restricting North Korea from expanding its weapons program or selling its nuclear materiel.

News leaks from the administration refer to this option as one of "interdiction."

"That's another way of saying 'blockade,' " said L. Gordon Flake, head of the Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs in Washington. "It's not a Cuban-missile-crisis type of blockade where you line ships up at sea," but could instead mean stopping ships believed to contain North Korean missiles or nuclear technology.

At U.S. urging, Spanish forces stopped a North Korean vessel headed for Yemen in December. To the Bush administration's chagrin, the ship was carrying missiles but had to be released because the shipment was perfectly legal. Only if the U.N. were to impose sanctions would such shipments be prohibited.

"Of course at this point in the game, we're going to claim we're not pursuing sanctions," Flake said. But because military options against North Korea are unpalatable, "outside of economic sanctions, there's not a lot the U.N. Security Council can do. And sanctions alone don't address the fundamental concerns of the post-9/11 world."







In Tokyo, Powell's discussions could include the status of the U.S.-Japanese missile-defense research program. There have been vague reports that North Korea could react to a Security Council condemnation by resuming its missile tests, according to Larry A. Niksch, an Asian affairs specialist at the Congressional Research Service.

"The broader question is, how far are they willing to go with this? Is there a limit?" Niksch said. "If they are actively considering taking advantage of a U.S. war on Iraq to conduct a nuclear breakout and produce nuclear weapons, then I would certainly expect a long-range missile test in addition to North Korea producing plutonium through reprocessing."

Powell has said he wishes the Chinese would do more to try to persuade the North Koreans to freeze, if not reverse, their nuclear ambitions. The Chinese have insisted that they are against a nuclearized Korean peninsula but have stressed the need for Washington to negotiate directly with North Korea.

While the Bush administration's priority will be to make sure that Japan, South Korea and the U.S. are in lock-step on North Korea policy, officials are eager to develop a proposal for dealing with North Korea that the Chinese and the Russians will also support.

The State Department did not say whether Powell will meet with incoming President Roh. The two men have never met. Although intermediaries have stressed that Roh is neither as anti-American nor as impulsive in his off-the-cuff remarks as news reports suggest, the Bush administration will have to work hard to establish strong ties with Roh's inexperienced team -- and make sure that North Korea gets a message of unity.

In a speech to the South Korean Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday, Roh said relations with the United States were "excellent," but he went on to highlight differences with the U.S. in tactics toward North Korea.

"In the U.S. too, there are differences of opinion between hard-liners and others, and there has been no decision as to whether to use force to get North Korea to abandon its nuclear program," Roh said. "Our differences are in this, a tactical issue. We can speak with the same voice as the U.S., but speak differently internationally."







### Next week, United Nations Inspectors Get Their First Look at Iranian Nuclear Facilities

*Guy Dinmore and Najmeh Bozorgmehr, Financial Times (London), 19 February 2003, p. 15, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

Hajji Baba of Isfahan, a popular adventure book published in 1824, the protagonist goes on a secret mission beyond Persia. He learns that the English have a parliament where madmen meet for the purposes of quarrelling, the Flemish are boorish devotees of cheese and salt-fish, and the Italians pay much for the privilege of ringing church bells. But he learns almost nothing of the New World, except that it is reached by ship and not underground as rumored.

Nearly 200 years have passed since James Morier wove his picaresque tales of an apprentice barber, but the gulf of misunderstanding is as wide as ever between an America preparing to go to war and an Iran preparing to go nuclear. Mohammed Elbaradei, head of the United Nations nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency, is set to carry out his agency's first inspections next week of two new nuclear facilities in Iran.

In testimony to Congress last week, George Tenet, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, revealed the depths of US concern over weapons proliferation to rogue states and terrorist groups. The US had seen "disturbing signs" that al-Qaeda had established a "presence" in both Iraq and Iran, and was expected to resume the offensive. "We have entered a new world of proliferation," Mr Tenet said of weapons of mass destruction. "The domino theory of the 21st century may well be nuclear." His comments followed confirmation by Gholam-Reza Aqazadeh, head of Iran's Nuclear Energy Organization, that Iran would develop the full cycle of nuclear fuel from the mining and processing of uranium to its enrichment and use in reactors for peaceful purposes. Just a few days earlier, he revealed that a plant in Isfahan for preparing uranium was close to completion.

The sites of concern to the IAEA are in Natanz and Arak. Both are under construction. Natanz is believed to be a gas centrifuge plant to enrich uranium for use in reactors (and with further enrichment for possible use in a bomb). Arak will produce heavy water, used as a moderator in a different kind of reactor, which Iran does not have. This process could also be a first step towards producing plutonium, another route for the acquisition of a nuclear device.

In delaying notifying the IAEA about the two facilities, Iran did not break any commitments made as a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. But officials of the nuclear watchdog are frustrated that they were not told of them earlier. There is little doubt that Iran will place the two plants under IAEA safeguards, as it has done with the Bushehr nuclear power plant, currently being built by the Russian government. Iran plans six such reactors by 2020. But Iran is unlikely to agree to an additional safeguards protocol that would allow IAEA inspectors access to any facilities. Under the current requirements, the IAEA can inspect only facilities that Iran declares.

The Bush administration fears the Islamic republic's ultimate aim is to follow the example of North Korea, expelling IAEA inspectors and quitting the NPT. The fear is that in several years, with official or unofficial technical assistance from Russia, Iran would be able to move quickly towards production of a substantial number of nuclear weapons. "Iran's ambitious and costly pursuit of a complete nuclear fuel cycle only makes sense if it's in support of a nuclear weapons program," said Richard Boucher, State Department spokesman.

In his testimony to Congress, Colin Powell, secretary of state, said of Iran's nuclear program: "We are working with the Russians to bring this under control." But he added it was not appropriate to use threats or to start "moving down a track" akin to those the US has chosen with Iraq and North Korea. Such statements have left many wondering how the US intends to deal with Iran, especially in the run-up to a war on Iraq.

Privately, US officials say there is no coherent policy. The sense of anger and humiliation over the embassy hostage crisis that lasted for 444 days between 1979 and 1981 still lingers. Twenty-two years without formal relations and few direct communications have not helped. The Bush administration is split between neo-conservatives who want to isolate what the president calls a member of the "axis of evil" and the engagers, including Mr. Powell, who want to open a deeper dialogue.







The division reflects diverging perceptions of Iran. Hawks in the Pentagon and the National Security Council see the country's clerical regime in the throes of internal collapse beset by a people on the verge of rebellion, while the State Department and perhaps the CIA give the Islamic theocracy a rather later sell-by date. This group also believes Iran could play a role in counter-terrorism with encouragement from Washington.

Internal disagreements notwithstanding, the US has quietly resumed its limited engagement with Iran that began with ousting the Taliban from Afghanistan in 2001, in hopes of enlisting its help with Iraq. US officials say that in the course of the United Nations-brokered multinational talks on Afghanistan, the US and Iran discussed preventing members of the Iraqi regime from disappearing in Iran, how to deal with an expected refugee exodus and treatment of any downed pilots that land on Iranian soil.

The message the US has sought to convey is that Iran should keep out of the coming conflict. Military intervention by any of Iraq's neighbors, namely Iran and Turkey, threatens to break up Iraq and prompt a regional crisis. But officials are unsure of precisely what role Iran could play. Says one: "We are really reading the tea-leaves. There are some fertile areas for co-operation but we are unsure if the response we are getting out of Tehran is authoritative."

That hesitation derives from the experience of a year ago. After several months of co-operation likewise over Afghanistan, the divisions in Iran's regime surfaced; hardliners began to help al-Qaeda fugitives in transit and to cut deals with Afghan warlords that undermined the Kabul government. Despite that, many al-Qaeda suspects were seized and deported. Iran passed to Saudi Arabia transcripts of interrogations with Saudi nationals, knowing these would reach the US. One senior Iranian official says co-operation again with the US over Iraq will be "indirect" and not as open as in Afghanistan. "With the present internal tensions in Iran, there cannot be a direct political dialogue with the US," he says.

The scars left in Iran from the 1980-88 war with Iraq run deep. Iranians still regard their unpredictable neighbour as the number one security threat. "Iran wants the removal of Saddam Hussein. Every option is better than Saddam," says Hossein Rassam, a veteran commentator in Tehran. Iran, he says, can use its strategic position and close relations with Iraq's opposition Kurds and Shia Muslims to its advantage. In return, Tehran is hoping the US will ease its sanctions and weaken its opposition to Iran's bid to join the World Trade Organization. Aha Hashemi, a cleric and editor-in-chief of Entekhab, an influential national newspaper, who has sought to bridge the differences between Mohammad Khatami, the reformist president, and his hardline rivals, believes that despite the rhetoric in both capitals the Iranian government wants to resolve its problems with the US. "If these moves go on and if nothing unexpected happens, the process will move towards normalization," he said recently. "But we cannot expect a quick resolution."

Hawks in Washington hope rising popular discontent in Iran will add to pressure on Mr Khatami. A recent opinion poll in Tehran showed the number of Iranians wanting "fundamental change" - in other words, regime change - had risen over 18 months from 31 to 45 per cent. Only 49 per cent of those polled believed the president's reforms were working, down from 63 per cent. Defenders of the conservative establishment remained constant at just 6 per cent. "Officials should definitely consider this trend to be dangerous," says pollster Behruz Geranpayeh. Mr Geranpayeh was jailed and his institute silenced after he released the results of another poll showing two-thirds of Iranians disagreed with official policy and wanted to resume relations with the US. He was recently released on bail.

Analysts in Tehran say the regime is demonstrating the flexibility that has allowed it to survive this long. Traditionalist clerics, who have mostly kept away from politics in the belief that it damages their religious standing, are finding their voices. They are concerned that the regime is turning a restive younger generation away from Islam. Such clerics could help prevent fundamentalist ayatollahs from removing the president and his supporters.

Mr Rassam says the hardliners are bowing to popular US pressure and adopting a softer stance toward Mr Khatami. But he warns they are not in retreat. There is still a danger, he says, that hardliners, perhaps in the Revolutionary Guards, could find other ways to reapply pressure on Mr Khatami. For example, they might help al-Qaeda in its campaign against the US, thereby creating a crisis that could be used to justify further internal repression.

The release from five years of house arrest of Grand Ayatollah Hossein Ali Montazeri, Iran's most prominent dissident cleric, was seen by some as a concession to the public and the clergy. Others say the regime could not contemplate







the risks of having the ailing ayatollah die at home. The grand ayatollah agrees with President Khatami, whose convictions rest on a marriage of Islam and democracy, on the reform agenda.

But Mr Khatami's popularity has been sliding as Iranians lose patience with the slow pace of reforms. Students protesting late last year against the death sentence imposed on Hashem Aghajari, a lecturer who challenged religious rule, demonstrated that the debate is shifting away from Islamic democracy versus Islamic despotism to secular republicanism against clerical rule. "We have reached the conclusion that reforming this system is impossible," says Ezzatollah Sahabi, a veteran nationalist released from prison last year.

As the "axis of evil" and "Great Satan" - what the Iranian government calls the US - contemplate each other through a fog of belligerent rhetoric only likely to worsen over a war in Iraq, the concept of an Iran lurching towards a full-blown nuclear program and unpredictable swings in policy at the top has politicians in Washington scrambling for answers.

Additional reporting by Tony Walker in Tehran

Ayatollah Abbas Hosseini Ghaem-Maghami, politician and theologian, considers himself a bridge between Iran's moderates and radicals.

At 34, he is the country's youngest ayatollah. He has written scores of books and articles. And he once ran for parliament, albeit unsuccessfully.

"The disputes between factions are very complicated but what is seen on the surface is not the reality. A big problem for outside observers is that they base their judgments on surface happenings. But one needs a deep understanding of the factions and individuals themselves."

Indeed, one might easily believe - as many Iranians do - that the Islamic republic is on the brink of another upheaval as significant as the 1979 revolution that kicked out the shah and brought in the ayatollahs.

Bleak assessments are heard from the leftwing reformists backing Mohammad Khatami, the popularly elected president, and from his hard-line and non-elected opponents in institutions affiliated with Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the supreme leader. As public support for the regime slides ever lower, manifesting itself occasionally in protests, both sides talk openly of the "end-game" and warn each other that they will all go down together if the regime collapses.

Crucial to the outcome of this contest is the fate of two bills proposed by the president last September and slowly passing through parliament. Both proposed laws would seriously diminish the powers of two key institutions controlled by hard-line clerics: the judiciary and the Guardian Council. One would give Mr Khatami the power to block political trials; the other would remove the Guardian Council's power to vet candidates for parliamentary elections.

Mr Khatami has indicated he might resign if the bills are rejected, a threat taken seriously by his rivals, who regard his success at engaging the west as critical for regime survival. For the moment, there is no one of similar stature who might replace him, from either camp.

Some hardliners have pledged to block the bills and loyal Revolutionary Guards commanders are preparing for the unrest they expect if that happens. This has given rise to suspicions that the arch-conservatives are ready to stage what would amount to a coup against the president and parliament.

Ayatollah Ghaem-Maghami, however, dismisses such talk. "The real differences are not between the political parties in the system but between those within and those without. The parties in the system have ideological differences, but their differences are more tactical," he says. He notes, for example, that those reformists now inclined to restore relations with the US were firmly opposed just a few years ago, whereas some conservatives have shifted in the other direction.

Describing himself as close to the president, the ayatollah continues: "The two bills are very important to Mr Khatami, but I don't think he will resign if they are rejected. He is committed to his promises to the people and is a very religious man and has a very democratic spirit. Power is not important to him. If at any time he feels that staying in







power cannot help him carry out his plans, and he has no chance to remain loyal to his promises, then he would not stay."

Ayatollah Ghaem-Maghami concedes there is a division between those who believe their right to rule derives from the people, and those who see their legitimacy as bestowed by God. In *Power and Legitimacy*, his thesis on Islamic democracy, the ayatollah argues that the system must have both popular and divine support.

If religion gets involved in the ruling system or politics, it is not because God said religion should rule the political system, but because the people wanted that and gave it legitimacy, he argues.

He diverges from fundamentalists - who say the supreme leader is just that - by insisting that everyone is bound by the constitution approved by popular vote.

The US, he says, has a "naive" analysis of the situation in Iran, basing its anti-regime stance on superficial incidents. Yes, he says, there are differences of opinion between the three leading clerics in Iran - the president, the supreme leader and Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president - but he insists they do not run deep.

They are capable of resolving all this, he says.







### Nigeria; Worrying Problem of Small Arms Proliferation

*Africa News, 18 February 2003, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

At the last count, more than 30 communal clashes, bordering on religious ethnic conflicts have been recorded throughout the country between 1999 and 2002 with each claiming hundreds of lives and properties, running into several millions of naira. Similarly, many people, including women and children had been displaced in the process, resulting in untold hardship and suffering for them.

As the incidence of ethnic/religious conflicts becomes worrying, a national workshop on the methods and techniques of arms control through the promotion of a culture of peace in Nigeria was put together recently to find lasting solution to the menace.

The workshop was organized in the spirit of the agreement and moratorium on the importation, exportation and manufacture of light weapons signed by ECOWAS countries at Bamako, Mali, in November, 1996, at a conference organized by UNDP and UNIDIR. The moratorium had demanded that member countries set up a National Committee (NATCOM), to come up with ideas on the best way to curtail such violent conflicts. The Moratorium is a voluntary confidence building measure made possible by the political will of the West African leaders to deal with the widespread availability and indiscriminate use of light weapons.

The conceptual understanding of the Moratorium is based on the premise that economic and social development is dependent on a secure and stable political environment. This phenomenon has in turn given rise to new integrated and proportional approach to security and development, which explicitly links security, stability, human rights, disarmament and development.

The Nigerian government, conscious of the fact that effective development requires long-term stability and security, had long set up its own NATCOM headed by a Commissioner of Police, Lawrence Alobi, with the mandate to work with all stakeholders to find a lasting solution to the problem.

Proliferation of arms, though a global problem, cannot be solved without internal/national action. It is believed that if each country evolves its own action and internal monitoring, it would go a long way to at least, reduce the problem.

The passing of a Resolution by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, a subsidiary of UNESCO, on firearm regulation endorsed by 33 countries stated that realizing that "firearms tend to flow from unregulated to regulated areas", there was need for all to work toward international standards on domestic control, as well as international standards to control the flow of small arms.

The Federal Government of Nigeria, standing by UN Resolution 56/24, which adopted the program of action to prevent, combat and eradicate illicit trade on small arms and light weapons (NCPSLAW), also set up on July 11, 2001, a body to carry out a feasibility study on this problem in Nigeria.

But in spite of all these efforts, the problem of arms proliferation in Nigeria has soared alarmingly lately and the question is how do all these arms, whether small or light, get into the country, given the number of security agencies and institution all over?

In a paper presented at the workshop, the Minister of State for Defense (Army), Alhaji Lawal Batagarawa, said the problem of small arms proliferation was not only complex, it was sophisticated, global as well as a lucrative business, stating that to effectively control the problem requires coordinated efforts of all governments worldwide. The minister said regional and sub-regional governments efforts aimed at curbing the menace had not been effective because powerful organizations like the US National Rifle Association and Firearms Manufacturers Association were working against the measures with all their might.

The complex nature of the international firearms business, Batagarawa further said, was also closely associated with drug trade and money laundering known to be controlled by cartels headed by very rich, influential and highly criminal minded individuals. Some of them, connected to governments, he said, have become untouchables.







Added to that, the minister noted that the near total neglect suffered by most Nigerian security institutions, including the Nigeria Police, in the past two decades had in no small way weakened and incapacitated them so much that they lack the capacity to perform their roles effectively. Consequently, the Police Force, he said, is poorly trained, ill-equipped, and ill-motivated to face the present reality. Given this poor state of our Police and other security agencies, it is almost impossible for them to face well-equipped, organized, sophisticated and rich criminals, he added, noting that the problem of official arms sometimes finding their way into criminal hands by acts of omission or commission by those in official possession of them. The arms were stolen, borrowed or sold by government officials and security agencies.

Proliferation of arms, he said, is also resulting from the experiences of many Nigerians killed, maimed or harassed during ethnic, religious, political and other violent crimes, who having lost confidence in the ability of the police to protect them, resort to illegal possession of firearms for self protection.

Bankruptcy of our moral values and the corresponding increase in corruption and indiscipline over the years, which have created deep frustration and a sense of hopelessness among the generality of our active population especially the youths, coupled with religious intolerance, ethnicity and unhealthy struggle for power among the elites, he noted as well, were the major catalysts in the disruption of peace in Nigeria, regretting that poverty, political intolerance and insecurity have further encouraged the demand and use of firearms, thereby boosting the illegal trade.

He noted as well that illegal arms traffickers and local manufacturers, not minding the devastating effect, have continued to produce and import them for economic and selfish reasons.

The woes brought upon the nation by wrong people possessing illicit arms, the minister, said, can never be quantified-in terms of lives, property and opportunities lost.

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECOWAS, Dr. (Mrs.) Aribisala, on her part, argued that though the problem of small arms proliferation was a global problem, the difference between the problem in Nigeria and other countries lies in the fact that people, take interest in slaughtering other people over the years, have never been brought to book to serve as deterrent to others, pointing out that \_if there is a hiding place for those, who perpetrate evil, there will never be an end to the problem\_. Movement of arms in the West Africa sub-region, she said, became easier with coming into effect of the trade liberalization, open-air agreement, transportation, and open border policy of the region, made the borders more porous, noting that the consequences of importation of small arms into the sub-region cannot be quantified, having been found to fuel insecurity, suspicion, destroy democracies, retard economic and social development, and other progress recorded in other areas while millions of dollars are lost in foreign investment. Apart from all the mentioned problem arising from the proliferation of illicit small arms, the most devastating effect is that it debases human rights and affects the vulnerable, especially children, teenagers, and women, Dr. Aribisala added. The light weight, transportability and ease of use of small arms and light weapons, she said, has facilitated one of the most abusive elements of contemporary armed conflicts notably the engagement of children as armed combatants.

She attempted a solution to the problem, stating that it was strongly believed that capacity building of the police was a necessity, to enable them effectively perform their statutory functions. The government, apart from evolving a viable social security system for its citizenry, she added, must seriously address the issue of economic and social problems associated with poverty, corruption, illiteracy, youth unemployment and marginalization just as serious efforts must be made to develop the border communities, which have always felt they had always felt that they have no stake in the country for lack of development in basic amenities. She suggested the need for security agencies at the borders to cooperate with each other and be equipped with modern communication and transportation facilities in order to enhance their operation. Also, a national arms registry should be established to regulate, monitor and control the use of firearms in Nigeria while the citizenry should be educated and enlightened on the need to develop and promote the culture of peace because small arms bring devastation, exacerbate conflict, spark refugee flow, undermine the rule of law, and spawn a culture of violence and impunity, she further submitted, arguing above all that small arms were threat to peace and development, democracy and human rights.

those, who perpetrate evil, there will never be an end to the problem\_. Movement of arms in the West Africa sub-region, she said, became easier with coming into effect of the trade liberalization, open-air agreement, transportation, and open border policy of the region, made the borders more porous, noting that the consequences of importation of







small arms into the sub-region cannot be quantified, having been found to fuel insecurity, suspicion, destroy democracies, retard economic and social development, and other progress recorded in other areas while millions of dollars are lost in foreign investment. Apart from all the mentioned problem arising from the proliferation of illicit small arms, the most devastating effect is that it debases human rights and affects the vulnerable, especially children, teenagers, and women, Dr. Aribisala added. The light weight, transportability and ease of use of small arms and light weapons, she said, has facilitated one of the most abusive elements of contemporary armed conflicts notably the engagement of children as armed combatants.

She attempted a solution to the problem, stating that it was strongly believed that capacity building of the police was a necessity, to enable them effectively perform their statutory functions. The government, apart from evolving a viable social security system for its citizenry, she added, must seriously address the issue of economic and social problems associated with poverty, corruption, illiteracy, youth unemployment and marginalization just as serious efforts must be made to develop the border communities, which have always felt they had always felt that they have no stake in the country for lack of development in basic amenities. She suggested the need for security agencies at the borders to cooperate with each other and be equipped with modern communication and transportation facilities in order to enhance their operation. Also, a national arms registry should be established to regulate, monitor and control the use of firearms in Nigeria while the citizenry should be educated and enlightened on the need to develop and promote the culture of peace because small arms bring devastation, exacerbate conflict, spark refugee flow, undermine the rule of law, and spawn a culture of violence and impunity, she further submitted, arguing above all that small arms were threat to peace and development, democracy and human rights.







### Inspectors Fault Iraqi Follow-Up; No 'Positive Moves' Seen Since Friday

*Rajiv Chandrasekaran, Washington Post, 20 February 2003, p. 1, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

President Saddam Hussein's government, apparently emboldened by antiwar sentiment at the U.N. Security Council and in worldwide street protests, has not followed through on its promises of increased cooperation with U.N. arms inspectors, according to inspectors in Iraq.

No Iraqi scientist involved in biological, chemical or missile technology has consented to a private interview with the inspectors since Feb. 7, the day before the two chief U.N. inspectors arrived here for talks with Iraqi officials. The United Nations also has not received additional documents about past weapons programs, despite the government's pledge to set up a commission to scour the country for evidence sought by the inspectors, U.N. officials said.

One U.N. official here said that since Friday's Security Council meeting, "we have not seen any positive moves on the part of Iraq." Another charged, "They are not fulfilling their promises." If Iraq does not move quickly to arrange more private interviews and provide more evidence, the chief inspector, Hans Blix, likely will deliver a more downcast assessment of Iraqi cooperation when he next reports to the Security Council, a U.N. official said. A critical report from Blix could prove instrumental to U.S. and British efforts to build support for a new council resolution authorizing force against Iraq.

In news conferences and interviews, Iraqi officials have glossed over warnings from Blix -- and from governments of Security Council members opposed to war -- that Iraq must take additional steps to satisfy a disarmament resolution the council passed unanimously on Nov. 8. The overriding analysis among officials here is that Iraq has complied and that everyone, save the U.S. and British governments, now views Iraq as the aggrieved party.

"We have done what was asked of us -- and the whole world sees that," a senior Iraqi official said, noting that Iraq last week acceded to U.N. demands for a presidential decree banning weapons of mass destruction and to allow U-2 surveillance planes to fly over the country. "All these criticisms are just raised by the Americans as a way to justify their aggression."

Newspapers here, which are state-controlled, have pushed a similar line in the wake of the protests, proclaiming that Hussein's government parried U.S. efforts to forge an international coalition to confront Iraq. Babel, a paper run by Hussein's eldest son, Uday, said the United States and Britain face "humiliating international isolation."

"The antiwar demonstrations across the world reflect a new chapter in the global balance of power," the paper said in an editorial earlier this week. "Everyone has noted that a new multipolar world is emerging. Iraq, with its oil, its resistance, its wise leaders and its strategic vision is an important and fundamental actor in this multipolar world."

Iraqi officials, displaying a similar confidence, have shifted their message from "We are complying" to a more insistent call for the lifting of economic sanctions imposed after Iraq's 1990 invasion of Kuwait.

U.N. officials and diplomats here express belief that Hussein's government may have misread the position of most council members or may be seeking to continue a game of brinkmanship by parcelling out concessions at the last minute to stymie U.S. efforts to generate consensus for military action.

"They are feeling: The world opinion is with us. We can resist further pressure. We have time. We can play with the U.S. and U.K.," a U.N. official said. "This is very dangerous."

Among the most visible issues testing Iraq's compliance is the ability of inspectors to conduct private interviews with Iraqi scientists.

The U.N. resolution authorizing the latest round of inspections requires Iraq to provide "private access" to anyone the inspectors wish to interview. But for weeks, as the inspectors asked to conduct confidential sessions, every scientist they approached insisted on having a government official present.







Iraqi officials said the scientists were worried about having their testimony mischaracterized. But U.N. and U.S. officials contend that Hussein's government prevented scientists from speaking in private because of fear they might spill secrets about banned weapons programs.

Then, on Feb. 6, as Iraq was facing growing pressure to demonstrate more cooperation with the inspectors, it announced that one of its scientists had agreed to conduct a private interview. The next day, two others also consented to confidential questioning.

But since then, the inspectors have been unable to interview any other nuclear, biological or missile expert in private. They have asked to question 28 non-nuclear scientists, but most have insisted on having a government representative present. Although five non-nuclear scientists did agree to questioning without a government representative, they each insisted on making a tape recording of the session. The inspectors refused to go forward with those interviews because of concern that making a tape, which likely would wind up in the government's hands, would dissuade the scientists from providing candid answers.

"The tape recorder has been the stumbling block," one U.N. official said.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has conducted several taped interviews of nuclear scientists. It has agreed in some cases to allow the scientists to retain the tape; in other cases, the agency kept the tape. The interviews with nuclear scientists, however, are less controversial because U.N. experts already have said they do not believe Iraq has an active nuclear weapons program.

Another test of Iraq's compliance likely will emerge when Blix formally informs Iraq that its Al Samoud 2 missiles violate a 93-mile range limit imposed by U.N. resolutions after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, U.N. officials said.

Blix has not revealed what he will demand of Hussein's government. U.N. officials said he could insist that Iraq destroy the missiles, modify them to reduce their range or disassemble them.

Over the past few days, U.N. inspectors have visited several military facilities where the missiles are assembled, tested and stored. A U.N. spokesman here said metallic identification tags have been placed on "dozens" of the missiles. The inspectors have identified and tagged 380 rocket engines that Blix said were illegally imported for use in the Al Samoud missiles.

Iraqi officials have not said what they would do if they were ordered to destroy the missiles, which could be a potentially valuable asset in fighting any invading U.S. forces. Foreign Minister Naji Sabri on Tuesday called the issue too hypothetical for a response now.

Blix also has requested that the government turn over a list of people who participated in what Iraq said was the destruction of its biological weapons in the early 1990s. Iraq handed over a list earlier this month of those involved in the destruction of chemical weapons.

The U.N. official here said he expects Iraq eventually to relent on the interviews and perhaps the missiles only if demands from Blix and Security Council members are aggressive enough. "What we've seen is that without pressure, Iraq is not going to cooperate with the inspectors," he said.







### U.S., Britain to Set Deadlines for U.N., Iraq

*Maggie Farley and Robin Wright, Los Angeles Times, 20 February 2003, p. 1, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

The United States and Britain will present a resolution to the Security Council "in the next few working days" authorizing the use of military force to disarm Iraq and imposing a deadline for the council to vote on it, U.S. and British officials said Wednesday.

British Ambassador Jeremy Greenstock said the draft resolution would also set a cutoff date for Iraq's compliance, "implicitly or explicitly" to force the Security Council to limit how much longer inspections should continue without Baghdad's full cooperation.

The resolution, which the Bush administration had been expected to unveil days ago, has been held up by haggling between the U.S. and Britain on its timing and content, as well as by the growing antiwar movement worldwide and opposition within the Security Council. Diplomats said that even this week's massive storm on the East Coast slowed the pace, with officials slogging through snow-covered streets to reach a secure location to discuss the language. Council opposition remained strong Wednesday, with key members stiffening their positions. But after a 30-minute phone conversation, President Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair agreed that a new resolution should compel the council to take action sooner rather than later.

The three basic elements of the proposed resolution are that Iraq is in material breach of U.N. resolutions; that it was given one final chance and failed to fully comply, which amounts to a further breach; and that it is time for members of the international community to move forward with the "serious consequences" spelled out in Resolution 1441, which returned weapons inspectors to Iraq late last year, U.S. officials said Wednesday.

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell urged Germany and the veto-holding council members who oppose war -- France, Russia and China -- not to be "afraid" to take responsibility for enforcing the U.N. resolutions that call on Iraq to disarm.

"It cannot be a satisfactory solution for inspections just to continue forever because some nations are afraid of stepping up to the responsibility of imposing the will of the international community," Powell said in an interview with Radio France released Wednesday by the State Department.

Powell confirmed that the process will continue to unfold until chief weapons inspector Hans Blix makes another progress report at the end of the month -- and, Powell hinted, possibly once again in mid-March. But the United States is reluctant to make a decision on a further report from the inspectors, as the French have demanded, until it finds out what the next report concludes, Powell said.

The White House said Wednesday that the tone and content of the resolution are not "finally settled" and that Bush will work closely with allies to press for a resolution acceptable to members of the deeply divided Security Council.

The goal is a "straightforward, simple resolution that enforces Resolution 1441," White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said.

But the key council members hardened their positions Wednesday. Russian President Vladimir V. Putin and Chinese President Jiang Zemin agreed by phone that inspectors should be allowed to continue their work indefinitely, lending weight to France's stance. In Germany, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder stood firm. "My opposition to war is fundamental," he said. "My position hasn't changed."

The U.S. and Britain have found resistance from unexpected quarters as well. In a rare or even unprecedented move to block a resolution, several of the 10 nonpermanent Security Council members have said they would abstain on a vote if the U.S. and Britain cannot find common ground with France, Russia and China, which insist that there is not yet enough evidence to justify an attack on Iraq. Syria and Germany are expected to vote against a resolution approving force. If Mexico, Chile, Angola, Pakistan and others abstain, a resolution would not have the nine votes required to pass.







"We don't have veto power," said Angola's ambassador, Ismael Gaspar Martins. "But we do have a power. We do have a voice."

The rotating members said their interest was not to scuttle a resolution but to pressure the permanent members to agree so as to give a resolution true moral authority.

"We don't think you can have a resolution if you don't have consensus in the Security Council," Chilean Ambassador Juan Gabriel Valdes said. "When we argue for time, we argue not simply for more time for the inspectors, but also for time to make progress in the council."

In an effort to find a neutral solution, several council members have asked Blix to identify unresolved disarmament questions that could be used as tests of Iraqi cooperation. These "benchmarks" could be coupled with an ultimatum -- but not necessarily enshrined in a resolution -- for Iraqi compliance. That would give the council a clear-cut standard on which to base a judgment, diplomats said. Blix met privately with ambassadors from Britain, Germany, France and the United States this week.

One such test could be for Iraq to destroy its Al-Samoud 2 missiles for exceeding the range allowed by the United Nations. Iraq's ambassador, Mohammed Douri, on Wednesday repeated Baghdad's denials that the missiles go farther than the 93-mile limit when weighted with a full payload, as a panel of missile experts concluded at the U.N. last week. Iraq is highly reluctant to surrender the missiles on the eve of a possible war.

But neither Blix nor U.S. officials fully endorse the "benchmark" idea. Blix has long said that Iraq is already required to answer unresolved questions about its disarmament, and the danger of providing a specific list is that Iraq may only respond to that list and hold back any other items.

"They could put just enough on the table to keep the process going," a U.S. official said.

Outside the U.N., Powell and Bush are working at a steady pace behind the scenes to rally support. Bush talked Wednesday with the emir of Qatar, Sheik Hamad ibn Khalifa al Thani, whose nation is playing a pivotal role in helping the U.S. military, and President Megawati Sukarnoputri of Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim nation.

In an effort to cajole Mexico, Chile and others back into the ring, one of the United States' staunchest allies on the council, Spain, is stepping in to help. Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar will stop in Mexico on his way to Bush's ranch near Crawford, Texas, on Friday and Saturday to try to persuade Mexican President Vicente Fox to firmly back the U.S. position.

The visit to the ranch, an honor accorded only a few close allies, is designed in part as a reward for Spain's support in both the U.S.-declared war on terrorism and in the push to confront Iraqi President Saddam Hussein on disarmament.

But even if the U.S. can't win the Security Council's support, the White House intends to charge ahead in bringing the showdown with Iraq to a confrontation.

"The question is not whether Iraq will be disarmed. The question is whether the Security Council will remain relevant," said Richard A. Grenell, the spokesman for the U.S. mission to the U.N.







### Some on Security Council Want to Avoid Taking Sides on Iraq

*Felicity Barringer, New York Times, 20 February 2003, p. 14, accessed via Lexis-Nexis*

Caught between domestic opposition to a war against Iraq and increasing pressure from the pro-war countries, diplomats from some of the uncommitted members of the Security Council said today that the Council's nonpermanent members should not be forced to take sides in the fight over a new resolution paving the way for war.

Two Council diplomats said they feared that a sharply divided vote in the Security Council would do little to legitimize an American-led war while undermining the legitimacy of the Council, which in the last decade has tended to operate by consensus. The Mexican ambassador, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, confirmed that he and his Chilean counterpart, Gabriel Valdes, had been working together on this. The two Latin American countries appear to be trying to persuade the five permanent members to reach an accommodation among themselves rather than press their nonpermanent colleagues to take sides.

Among the permanent members, France, Russia and China have argued that United Nations weapons inspectors are making progress and should be given more time to ensure Iraq's compliance with United Nations disarmament demands. The United States and Britain have argued that what appears to be an increase in cooperation is essentially meaningless, and that Iraq will never surrender whatever weapons of mass destruction it may have.

The determined neutrality of the two Latin American Council members could complicate the task of winning Council support for a new resolution on military action against Iraq. A new resolution has been sought by Britain in particular, to give the stamp of international legitimacy to a conflict that is widely opposed by British voters.

Opposition is just as intense, if not more so, in Chile, Mexico and Pakistan, which, along with Cameroon, Guinea and Angola, spoke out Friday for the peaceful disarmament of Iraq. Of the four other elected Council members, Spain and Bulgaria have been supporting the United States and Syria and Germany have sided with France.

Private and public pressure on some of these six uncommitted Council members has mounted in recent days. After the emotional Security Council meeting on Friday, in which only the United States, Britain, Spain and Bulgaria spoke against further delay in disarming Iraq, President Bush placed a phone call to President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan.

In Mexico City on Tuesday, the United States ambassador, Tony Garza, asked for Mexico's "support and understanding of our position."

"What we hope for," he told reporters, "are demonstrations of solidarity with our effort to disarm Iraq."

Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar of Spain is scheduled to meet with President Vicente Fox of Mexico later this week. Asked about Mexico's position on the new resolution expected from the United States, Mr. Aguilar, Mexico's envoy to the United Nations, said that "any resolution should be passed by consensus."

Pakistan, which with Syria is one of only two Muslim countries on the Security Council, is all too familiar with Islamic militance and anti-American sentiment at home. Its ambassador, Munir Akram, said, "Obviously we have to see how we can accommodate both the United States and our own political reality."

The resolution, which has been widely discussed in Washington, London and the United Nations, has been devised as a simple document declaring that the Iraqi government is in "material breach" of its 12-year-old obligations to disarm and that "serious consequences," meaning the use of military force, will follow if it does not immediately do so.

American officials have discussed establishing -- perhaps through Hans Blix, the chief United Nations inspector for chemical and biological weapons -- a series of benchmark tests which Iraq would have to meet by a very tight deadline. Mr. Blix is due to make a written report to the Council by March 1.







## WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

17 FEBRUARY 2003 to 21 FEBRUARY 2003

Several Council diplomats said that if he sets clear-cut tests for Iraqi compliance that the Iraqis fail, this might persuade them to vote on the American side.

A spokesman for Mr. Blix's office said he knew of no Security Council instruction authorizing Mr. Blix to establish such tests as part of his March 1 report.







## WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

17 FEBRUARY 2003 to 21 FEBRUARY 2003



— READINESS THROUGH AWARENESS —

